

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

BRYAN EAGLES,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM REUBART, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:20-cv-00514-LRH-CSD

ORDER

In this habeas corpus action, on May 10, 2022, the Court denied the respondents' motion to dismiss and ordered that the respondents had ninety days—until August 8, 2022—to file an answer. See Order entered May 10, 2022 (ECF No. 42).

On August 8, 2022, Respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 43), requesting a 98-day extension of time, to November 14, 2022. Respondents' counsel states that the extension of time is necessary because of "being stranded out of town following a canceled flight, medical quarantine, unexpected obligations related to an elderly family member, and a 9th Circuit answering brief," and because of her obligations in other cases. Motion for Extension of Time (ECF No. 43), p. 2. According to Respondents' counsel, Petitioner Bryan Eagles, represented by appointed counsel, does not oppose the motion for extension of time. The Court finds that the motion for extension of time is made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and there is good cause for the extension of time.

The Court will grant this motion for extension of time. However, given length of this extension of time and the amount of time that Respondents will have had to file their answer (about six months after resolution of the motion to dismiss), the Court will not look favorably upon any motion to further extend this deadline.

1 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Respondents' Motion for Extension
2 of Time (ECF No. 43) is **GRANTED**. Respondents will have until and including
3 **November 14, 2022**, to file their answer. In all other respects, the schedule for further
4 proceedings set forth in the order entered October 19, 2020 (ECF No. 8) will remain in
5 effect.

6
7 DATED THIS 9th day of August, 2022.

8
9 
10 _____
11 LARRY R. HICKS
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28